

BS



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/113,090	07/10/1998	KIA SILVERBROOK	ART34-US	7669

7590 09/29/2004

KIA SILVERBROOK
SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY
393 DARLING ST
BALMAIN, 2040
AUSTRALIA

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LUONG TRUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/113,090

Applicant(s)

SILVERBROOK ET AL.

Examiner

LUONG T NGUYEN

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on July 01, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In re page 3, Applicants stated that claim 1 has been amended to introduce further distinctions over the prior art citation.

It should be noted that claims 1-5 have been canceled in the Amendment filed on 8/01/01. The pending claims are 6-8.

In page 2, Applicants indicated that claim 6 is currently amended with the underlining limitation "determined from encoded cards inserted into the camera containing instructions for the manipulation of the blurred images, the programme control". However, this limitation has been recited in claim 6, which was amended in the Amendment filed on April 8, 2004.

Therefore, claim 6 has not been amended in this Amendment filed on July 01, 2004. And claim 6 should be indicated as "Previously presented" in the Amendment filed on July 01, 2004.

In re page 3, Applicants argue that the cited prior art documents do not describe the feature of programme control determined from encoded cards inserted into the camera containing instructions for the manipulation of the blurred images.

In response, regarding claim 6, Applicants recited the limitation "programme control determined from encoded cards inserted into the camera containing instructions for the manipulation of the blurred images." The Examiner considers that Ishikawa et al. discloses this

Art Unit: 2612

feature. Ishikawa et al. discloses a camera system, which includes an IC card into which suitable program such as exposure-program and/or data are written can be set by inserting into the camera body to control the functions of the camera (figure 3, column 4, lines 17-30).

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In the Specification, page 3, the reference character "2" has been used to designate both "Artcam central processor 2 (lines 3 and 5)" and "Artcard processor 2 (lines 8 and 11)". Further, it is noted that in the Drawing, Figure 1 indicates "Artcard processor 2". Therefore, the "Artcam central processor 2" on page 3, lines 3 and 5 should be changed to --Artcard processor 2--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 6-8 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 6 (line 9), "the camera" should be changed to --the camera system--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2612

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misawa et al. (US 5,282,044) in view of Ishikawa et al. (US 5,260,735) further in view of Suzuki (US 6,552,821).

Regarding claim 6, Misawa et al. disclose a camera shake correction system comprising an image sensor adapted to capture a still, blurred image (picture image data, column 6, lines 58-63) comprising at least one blurred pixel disclosed as CCD 22 (figure 10, column 6, lines 45-50); a velocity detector adapted to determine the velocity of the camera system relative to an external environment and to produce a velocity output indicative thereof, disclosed as angular velocity sensor 255 (figure 10, column 14, lines 14-15); a processor adapted to receive said blurred image from said image sensor and said velocity output from said velocity detector and to process said blurred image under programme control utilising the velocity output to deblur said at least one blurred pixel of said blurred image and to output said deblurred still image, disclosed as combination of camera shake correction part 235, signal processing circuit 42 and picture image correction circuit 144 (figures 9-10, column 12, line 66 through column 13, line 65, column 14, lines 5-45). It should be noted that since output signal from elements 235, 42 and 144 is different from the input signal, therefore, it is a "processor." Further, it is noted that the output signal from elements 235, 42 and 144 is free from deteriorated image quality because the camera shake is corrected ("deblurs" the image after it has been captured). This processor (combination of elements 235, 42, 144) processes the picture image data (still images) and outputs the deblurred still image (figures 1, 10, column 6, lines 58-63, column 13, line 66 - column 14, line 45).

Art Unit: 2612

Misawa et al. fail to specifically disclose the program control determined from encoded cards inserted into the camera containing instructions for the manipulation of the blurred images. However, Ishikawa et al. discloses a camera system, which includes an IC card into which suitable program such as exposure-program and/or data are written can be set by inserting into the camera body to control the functions of the camera (figure 3, column 4, lines 17-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system in Misawa et al. by the teaching of Ishikawa et al. to provide a camera system capable of adding functions to the camera and/or altering functions corresponding to various needs by individual users (column 1, lines 65-68).

Misawa et al. and Ishikawa et al. fail to specifically disclose a portable handheld camera; and said processor is connected to an integral inkjet printer internal to said portable handheld camera device for output of said deblurred still image on print media. However, Suzuki teaches a printer-built-in camera which employs an ink-jet printer (figures 1-2, column 4, lines 25-55) and figures 1, 2 also show that this printer-built-in camera is a portable handheld device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system in Misawa et al. and Ishikawa et al. by the teaching of Suzuki in order to provide a printer-built-in image-sensing apparatus which print-outputs a sensed image on print medium immediately after image sensing, and reduce waiting time from the completion of printing to the next image sensing (column 1, lines 12-17, column 2, line 66 – column 3, line 4).

Art Unit: 2612

6. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misawa et al. (US 5,282,044) in view of Ishikawa et al. (US 5,260,735) and Suzuki (US 6,552,821) further in view of Nobuoka (US 5,986,698).

Regarding claim 7, Misawa et al., Ishikawa et al. and Suzuki fail to specifically disclose wherein said velocity detector comprises an accelerometer. However, Nobuoka discloses an optical method, which detects overall movement of a video camera by using an acceleration sensor (accelerometer, column 1, lines 40-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system in Misawa et al., Ishikawa et al. and Suzuki by the teaching of Nobuoka in order to obtain an image sensing apparatus which detects the movement of the apparatus to perform vibration blur correction (column 1, lines 43-46, column 2, lines 55-56).

Regarding claim 8, Nobuoka discloses wherein said accelerometer comprises a micro-electro mechanical devices (gyro sensor, column 1, lines 44-46).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2612


will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUONG T NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 308-9297. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on (703) 305-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LN LN
9/20/2004


NGOC-YEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER